REMARKS

This application, as amended herein, contains claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 10-13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23-26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 36-39 and newly added independent claims 40, 41 and 42. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 14, 17, 19, 21, 22, 27, 30, 32, 34, and 35 have been canceled.

The objection to claim 29 is now moot in view of the change in its dependency.

Claims 1-7, 11-20, 24-33 and 37-39 were rejected as anticipated by Bunnell. Claims 1, 2, 8, 9 11-15, 21, 22, 24-28, 34, 35 and 37-39 were rejected as anticipated by Kaushik et al. Thes rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication of allowability of claims 10, 23 and 36. However, it is believed that Applicants are entitled to additional claims, as set forth below.

Applicants' invention as set forth in newly added independent claim 40 teaches a method not taught or suggested in the art of record. Specifically, a processor may be left in a sleeping or low energy state, until one of the peripheral devices is in a state requiring immediate or urgent servicing. It is only then that the processor is activated, to service that device. However, once the processor has been activated, all devices requiring servicing, regardless of their urgency state, are serviced. This approach has the advantage of amortizing the resources and power required to bring up the processor, over all

devices needing servicing, instead of bringing up the processor multiple times, as specifically note in applicants' specification at page 10, lines 8-13. It is an advantageous and efficient way of managing a present and eminent interrupts, in a manner not taught or suggested in the art of record.

In view of the failure of the cited references to teach or suggest Applicants' invention as set forth in claim 40, it is submitted that claim 40 is directed to patentable subject matter.

Claims 41 and 42 have been amended in a manner analogous to claim 40. For the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 40, it is submitted that claims 41 and 42 are also directed to patentable subject matter.

The remaining claims depend from one of independent claims 40, 41 or 42. These claims have further recitations, which in combination with the independent claim from which they depend, are not shown or suggested in the art of record.

With specific reference to claim 2, 15 and 28, when the processor changes activity states, an interrupt is supplied from the peripheral devices. In this case, it is not necessary to wait until a peripheral device has reached a state of urgency. The processor is changing states anyway, and interrupts may be efficiently processed.

With specific reference to claims 3, 16 and 29, detection of the activity state of the processor is done before the interrupt is supplied. Claims 5, 18 and 31 recite that an activity state of the processor is evaluated against an urgency state of the peripheral to determine whether the peripheral issues an interrupt. Claims 7, 20 and 32 recite that a peripheral device issues an interrupt only if the activity state of the processor is not low.

These dependent claims recite further advantageous features of the present invention. For the reasons set forth with respect to claims 40, 41 and 42, it is submitted that these claims are also patentable.

It is respectfully submitted that a careful review the portions of Bunnell relied upon by the Examiner on page 3, paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 of the office action simply do not support the rejections of the claims referred to in these paragraphs. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner review these portions of the reference, with a view toward withdrawing any rejections based on the previous reading of the reference.

Applicants petition for a one-month extension of time to respond to the office action. A check in the amount of $120 to cover the fee is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

David Aker

2/6/2006

David Aker, Reg. No. 29,277
23 Southern Road
Hartsdale, NY 10530

Date

Tel. & Fax 914 674-1094